

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action mailed June 22, 2005 has been received and the Examiner's comments carefully reviewed. The Office Action rejected Claims 1-22. Claims 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added. For at least the following reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

Drawing Objections

The drawings filed on 6/24/2003 were acceptable subject to correction of the informalities indicated on the attached "Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review," PTO-948. In response, Applicants have corrected the informalities and are submitting a substitute set of drawings including FIGURES 1-46. No new matter has been added.

Specification Objections

The Office Action objected to the specification for informalities. In response, the Applicants have submitted a substitute specification excluding the claims to correct the informalities. A clean version has also been supplied. No new matter has been added to the substitute specification.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-22 were objected to because of informalities. In response, the Applicants have amended Claims 1, 3, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 19, 21 and 22. The Office Action objected to line 6 in Claim 11, line 8 in Claim 16, and line 4 in Claim 22 but the Applicants submit that "changing "within the web page" to "in the schematic within the web page" changes the scope of the claim,

and that the suggested amendment is improper and that the lines within the Claims as originally presented are in proper form without making the suggested amendments. A component does not need to be chosen solely from in the schematic as suggested by the Office Action. As such, the above lines were not amended as suggested by the Office Action. The Applicants made the other suggested amendments. The Applicants respectfully request the Claim objections to be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections under 102(e)

The Office Action rejected Claims 1-7 and 9-22 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McDonald et al. (hereinafter "McDonald") (U.S. Patent No. 6,530,065). Applicants respectfully disagree and submit the following arguments.

Claim 1, as amended, recites in part "displaying the schematic on the client; wherein the schematic includes components that comprise wire components and electrical components that are movable within the schematic." Independent Claims 11, 16, and 22 have been similarly amended.

In contrast, McDonald describes a client-server simulation tool that does not allow components to be moved after the simulation has been created by a developer. Users may merely adjust various operating parameters relating to a part. The only time a component location may be specified in McDonald is when the simulation is actually designed by a developer prior to it being available to a user.

Claim 2 has been amended to recite “The method of Claim 1, wherein modifying the component within the schematic comprises selecting a wire component; determining an endpoint of the wire component to move; and moving the end point of the wire component.” In contrast, McDonald nor the other cited references disclose these recitations.

With regard to Claim 3, the Office Action states that the “choosing of the component involving palette choices to the user is part of the applet which controls how information are to be displayed with respect to the user interactions (see col. 8, lines 58-64; col. 8, line 65 to col. 9, line 34; col. 11, lines 20-37).” The applet as described in McDonald, however, does not meet the recited limitation. The applet in McDonald is only directed at defining values or parameters “a user may select or adjust with respect to a give component” (McDonald, col. 9, lines 24-25). McDonald does not disclose “a palette of choices to a user from which to select at least one from a component and a block” as recited in Claim 3.

The Office Action also states that McDonald discloses “adjusting one of a wire location, a component location, and a block symbol location” as recited in Claim 5 and refers the Applicants to col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 9). McDonald, however, is only disclosing that “a developer” may create the simulations and the netlists used for the simulations. As discussed above, McDonald does not allow any item to be moved once it displayed to the client. Any circuit design in McDonald is performed by a developer well in advance of deployment. McDonald even states that “the circuit simulates a good representation of an ultimate circuit in which the device may be employed by users, although the system described herein allows users to modify the circuit to more closely simulate their actual application (col. 10, lines 49-54). The

modification McDonald is referring to is the ability to adjust certain values or parameters that relate to a component, none of which include a location parameter.

Claim Rejections under 103(a)

The Office Action rejected Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDonald in view of Schmidt et al (US Patent No. 6,904,571). As per claim 8, the Office Action states that McDonald fails to specifically teach “providing the grid to aid placement of the component within the schematic.” As discussed above, McDonald fails to disclose other limitations found within Claim 8. The Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, all pending claims are believed to be allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have any further issues regarding this application, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney for the applicant at the telephone number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.



Timothy P. Sullivan

Registration No. 47,981

Direct Dial: 206.342.6254

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P. O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-0903
206.342.6200

